

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION
New Atty. Docket No. P0761-US
(Old Atty. Docket No.: 58593.000006)

Serial No.:09/808,351
Filed: March 15, 2001

Page 3 of 5

Remarks

Reconsideration and allowance of the above-referenced application are respectfully requested. The foregoing amendments are responsive to the February 10, 2005 Office Action. Applicants respectfully request entry of the requested amendments and reconsideration of the application in view of the following comments.

Response to the Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,269,409 issued to Solomon in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,734,831 issued Sanders. The rejection asserts that Solomon allegedly teaches each element of the claims except for connecting a second machine to the removable media, or modifying a second operating environment of the second machine, which is allegedly taught by Sanders.

The claims are directed a method of emulating a first operating environment on a second computer, and restoring the second operating environment upon termination of the emulation. None of the cited art teaches or suggests use of removable media to temporarily modify an operating environment of a second computer to emulate that of a first computer. In Claim 31, the requirement is included where the "second machine emulates the first operating environment of the first machine independent of the operation of the first machine." Thus, under the present claims, the second machine emulates the operating environment of the first machine regardless of the state of the first machine (i.e. the second machine is not connected in any way to the first machine, the first machine can be turned off, in a different location, destroyed, etc.). Solomon never teaches or suggests any independent operation of the second machine, only concurrent operation. The rejection asserts independent operation of the second machine is taught by Saunders in Figures 2B and 8. However, a close examination of Saunders indicates no such teaching is present. Saunders simply teaches a technique for controlling a server on a network through any machine on the network. In Figure 2B, a procedure for booting up the server (the first machine) is shown. In this boot up process, a floppy disk with configuration data is created. Figure 8 shows a Netscape browser window that uses this configuration data on a remote terminal (the second machine) to control the server. Note, the second machine uses a different interface (the Netscape browser) than the first machine, and thus no emulation is performed. Also, data entered in the second machine is simply transmitted to control processing on the first machine (see Fig. 3, col. 4, line 51- col. 5, line 26). Item 1000 says that the server is being accessed from the network (col. 4, lines 51-53). In step 1400, the user inputs information in the Netscape browser of Figure 8 and then "submits" this information to the server over the network. In step 1500, we see that it is indeed the server that processes the information. Thus, Saunders is simply teaching operating a first computer remotely, and does not teach independent emulation of the first computer. Thus, nothing in Saunders teaches any independent operation. Only the present invention teaches an truly independent emulation between two machines.

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION
New Atty. Docket No. P0761-US
(Old Atty. Docket No.: 58593.000006)

Serial No.:09/808,351
Filed: March 15, 2001

Page 4 of 5

In view of the foregoing distinctions, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 31 is patentably distinguished over the cited art. Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 31 is in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request allowance of Claim 31.

Claim 32 depends directly from Claim 31. Each dependent claim further defines the independent claim from which it depends. In view of the foregoing remarks regarding Claim 31, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 32 is likewise in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request allowance of dependent Claim 32.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 33 is indicated to contain allowable subject matter if rewritten in independent form. Applicant has rewritten Claim 33 in independent form, and thus Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 33 is now in condition for allowance.

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION
New Atty. Docket No. P0761-US
(Old Atty. Docket No.: 58593.000006)

Serial No.:09/808,351
Filed: March 15, 2001

Page 5 of 5

Summary

In view of the above amendments and remarks, all of the claims should be in condition for allowance. A formal notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

No fees are believed due with the filing of this response. However, if Applicants are in error, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to debit Applicant's Deposit Account (No. 50-2733) any fees that are currently due, as well as any fees due during the pendency of this application.

Please direct all future communications with regard to this application to the following address:


James T. Hagler
Patent Department
Iomega Corporation
10955 Vista Sorrento Parkway
San Diego, California 92130
(858) 314-7152 Tel. / (858) 314-7005

Certificate of Facsimile

I hereby certify that this correspondence (and any referred to as attached) is being sent via facsimile to 703-872-9306 to the Commissioner for Patents on the date indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 29, 2005

By: 
James T. Hagler
Reg. No. 40,631

IOmega CORPORATION
Patent Department
10955 Vista Sorrento Parkway
San Diego, California 92130
Telephone: (858) 314-7152
Facsimile: (858) 314-7005